

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY
HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE MEETING
February 8, 2006
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions	1
Groundwater Update and Tutorial Planning	1
Tank Closure/Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS).....	7
Committee Business.....	10
JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING WITH THE RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE AND THE BUDGETS AND CONTRACTS COMMITTEE	11
DOE-RL Fiscal Year 2006 (FY06) Budget Allocations and Funding.....	11
Action Items / Commitments	13
Handouts	14
Attendees.....	14

<i>This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.</i>

Welcome and Introductions

Maynard Plahuta, River and Plateau Committee (RAP) Chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. Changes to the January meeting summary were incorporated, and the summary was adopted.

Groundwater Update and Tutorial Planning

Maynard reviewed the committee's interest in providing the Hanford Advisory Board (Board) with a groundwater tutorial. He suggested the committee frame the tutorial and continue working to develop a draft values-based product as a tool to help guide the Department of Energy (DOE) and the regulatory agencies in groundwater cleanup and management.

Dick Wilde, Duratek Federal Services of Hanford (DFSH), provided an overview and status report on the Hanford groundwater program. Guidance for the groundwater program is based on requirements from the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), as well as advice on groundwater issues from the Board.

Additional funding for the groundwater program is expected from the DOE-Office of Environmental Management (DOE-EM) \$10 million earmark. DOE-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) met with DOE-EM to discuss proposals for using the

funding, and all groundwater remediation technologies being considered are described in white papers that will be made available to interested committee members. Within the next month, DOE-RL anticipates DOE-EM will release funding to implement some of the groundwater remediation projects.

Dick said approximately 80 square miles of groundwater is contaminated above drinking water standards. He indicated EPA's objective for groundwater cleanup is to return contaminated groundwater to its most beneficial use wherever practicable in a reasonable timeframe. The Cleanup Constraints and Challenges Team (C3T) Hanford Site Groundwater Strategy promotes preventing groundwater contamination as the primary means of protecting groundwater quality. In addition, he said the Congressional mandate for groundwater cleanup and management is consistent with stakeholder values previously articulated by the Board. Essential actions for groundwater protection include:

- Controlling high-risk contamination sources.
- Taking measures to reduce artificial recharge.
- Implementing effective groundwater remedies.
- Shrinking the footprint of contaminated areas.
- Integrating Hanford monitoring needs.

Until 1997, water used at the Hanford site was disposed of in ponds, trenches, and cribs, which pushed contamination into the groundwater, where it up-welled near or in the Columbia River. In 1997, un-permitted disposal of water in this manner ceased, and water is now captured, treated, and released at specified disposal sites. Dick said the goal of the river protection sampling approach is to remediate all contamination sources by 2012. DOE is making good progress in their efforts to identify and remediate all contamination sources.

Dick outlined the historic cause and current extent of groundwater contamination at various locations throughout the Hanford site. In the River Corridor (100 Area) the main issue is protecting aquatic life, specifically salmon and steelhead. There are concerns about the impacts of contamination in the riparian zone, especially the fluctuating low- and high-water stages of the river that can cause flushing action that washes contamination from riverbank seepage into the river. Monitoring the transfer of contamination into the river is achieved using aquifer sampling tubes instead of a land-based well, and by conducting biological sampling in the river. Dick also discussed efforts to remediate chromium plumes in the 100-H, 100-D/DR, and 100-K areas, and a strontium plume in the 100-N area. To address chromium plumes, DOE is evaluating new calcium polysulfide (CPS) treatment technology, which changes chromium-6 to a less hazardous chromium-3 form in-situ, significantly decreasing contamination. However, when CPS is injected, it lowers the oxygen level in the groundwater, so efforts are being made to identify how close to the river the treatment technology can be used without impacting the river's oxygen levels. To address strontium contamination, a barrier will be installed along the river, and apatite will be injected into the contaminant zone to fix strontium in place as the river flushes. DOE will continue to monitor the whole system to determine whether continued treatment is necessary. In most of the 100

Area sites, high-risk waste sources have been identified and excavated, and pump-and-treat well systems are operating effectively. Groundwater remediation efforts in the H Area are nearly complete. In the 100-D Area, a reservoir, used for back-up fire protection in the Central Plateau, is leaking. DOE plans to either line the reservoir or cease using it.

In the 300 Area, uranium concentrations are exceeding current drinking water standards. The traditional use of monitored natural attenuation to monitor uranium concentrations in the groundwater has proven ineffective, so more active treatment is necessary. Many waste sites have been excavated, but contamination in the river still exists. A year ago DOE started a “rebound test” to ensure the drinking water standard for groundwater uranium concentration of 48 parts per billion (ppb) is being met. Considering recent drinking water standards have revised allowable uranium concentration levels to 30 ppb, DOE is considering whether the pump-and-treat system should be reactivated to achieve the higher standard. DOE evaluated several treatment options for uranium contamination, and chose Polyphosphate Addition. Applying this technology is part of the DOE-EM funding request.

In the Central Plateau (200 Area) over 2,000 wells have been decommissioned and demolished (D&D), and about 3,000 remain in use, of which about 1,000 will likely not require D&D. Of the existing wells, 924 have been identified for high-priority D&D. Assuming adequate funding, well D&D would be complete in three to four years. In addition, DOE is repairing leaking water lines in areas above contaminant plumes or near waste sites. Leaking water lines are cleaned and lined with concrete that lasts 50 years. Five miles of leaking pipeline have been relined to date, and additional pipes will be relined as funding is made available.

Carbon tetrachloride concentrations in groundwater on the Central Plateau have decreased, but the overall size of the contamination plume has increased. DOE is conducting a characterization program to determine the lateral and vertical spread of carbon tet contamination. Carbon tet is removed using pump-and-treat systems to remove contaminated groundwater as well as using a vapor extraction system to remove and clean soil vapors. Currently, about 90 tons have been removed.

In addition to carbon tet contamination, DOE found a high concentration of technetium 99 (Tech-99) in the T Farm Area deeper in the groundwater than anticipated. A series of investigations are going on to determine how to address this contamination. Dick commented that it is a constant balance between gathering more data and conducting more cleanup activities.

Regulator Perspectives

- Larry Gadbois, EPA, said in the near future EPA is concerned about: 1) Determining what to do with moderate plumes in the 100 Area that exceed the maximum contaminant level (MCL), and 2) If a decision is made to implement alternate concentration limits (ACLs) under the core zone in the 200 Area, ensuring there is

time to clean up the core zone. Existing Board advice on MCLs and ACLs provides little guidance on specific projects. Larry indicated the level of effort is increasing, but no specified outcome has been determined. He said the point of compliance is either the most beneficial use of water or where there might be a contaminant exposure to water. He said a Board tutorial to help frame answers to these issues would be useful to the agencies.

- Dib Goswami, Ecology, said there is a flow diagram for determining the current status of groundwater remediation, showing where the agencies want groundwater remediation to be, technical practicability, and final decisions. He explained that Ecology does not set up ACLs; rather, it is DOE's evaluation of all potentially applicable technologies that determines what remediation is appropriate.

Dib indicated it is difficult to determine whether the pump-and-treat system is adequately reducing contamination. Technical impracticability makes it very difficult to determine the current status of contamination. He emphasized it would be good for the Board to understand the existing decision flow diagram on groundwater contamination issues.

Dib said the major regulatory issues are Tech-99 and uranium contamination in the deep vadose zone and deep groundwater, and the integration process between Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) activities and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) activities. He said it is important to integrate tank farm activities and cleanup milestones (M-45 and M-15) with overall groundwater cleanup activities.

Committee Discussion

- *Is the \$10 million groundwater remediation earmark for this year or next?* Dick said the earmark is part of the Fiscal Year 2006 (FY06) budget. He cautioned that the \$10 million would not be enough to achieve a complete cleanup program, and DOE-RL will continue to request funding in future budgets.
- *Greg deBruler asked how much water is leaking from the reservoir in the 100-D Area?* Dick was unsure, but DOE-RL will obtain the information for Greg.
- *What would it cost to reline the reservoir?* Dick said relining the reservoir would cost between \$1.3 million and \$1.8 million.
- *Are unidentified source terms a result of installing too few wells in the past?* Dick indicated that past efforts to identify source terms looked at contamination plumes from the surface, and DOE is now looking at the water to identify sources of contamination. In addition, oral histories from workers are used to help identify contamination sources. Dib noted that the River Corridor Contract has a provision requiring the removal of contamination sources, which is supposed to begin in June.
- *Is chromium contamination in the river from contaminated areas in the 100-D Area, and how does existing contamination compare to chromium standards?* Dick said chromium contamination in the river is from contaminated areas in the 100-Area, and the annual contamination levels in the river are known. Aquifer testing recorded

chromium concentrations of 200 ppb, compared to an ambient water quality standard of 10 ppb. The 100-D and 100-K areas are probably the highest-priority cleanup sites.

- Dirk Dunning requested a copy of the report on CPS. Dick said he would plan to present the report to the committee.
- *Has DOE done any studies on the effects of water flows from Cold Creek and Black Rock Reservoir on groundwater contamination?* Dick said contamination mounds in the Central Plateau are shrinking, but it is uncertain how much is a result of those flows. He explained that the amount of water flowing through Cold Creek from farm areas is not as significant as the large amount of natural recharge flowing under the Hanford site. However, potential changing future water flow conditions have not been evaluated. Dik indicated that Hanford site-wide groundwater modeling took water from Cold Creek and Black Rock Reservoir into consideration. Dirk said there is some concern that the amount of water in the Cold Creek incline is greater than the site-wide groundwater model considers. Dick said it is difficult to determine how contaminants might be pushed around based on changing hydrologic conditions.
- *How will contamination concentration limits be determined?* Larry said those concentration limits have yet to be worked out, and will be based on determining how the aquifer should be restored. Dirk cautioned making a decision to develop ultimate groundwater contamination concentration limits, since higher standards might not have to be met in the future and the only option would be to excavate the area. Larry said measuring contaminant concentrations in the river demonstrates the correlation between concentrations in the upland aquifer and in the river.
- *Dirk asked whether DOE has looked into reinstating the Site Technology Coordination Group (STCG), which the Board has emphasized in recent advice?* Karen Lutz, DOE-RL, said she would find out and get back to the committee.

The committee discussed how to bring groundwater information to the Board and how to develop Board values into a useful product for DOE. The Board's last groundwater tutorial occurred three years ago.

- Shelley said she prefers developing a Board groundwater tutorial once the committee has had the opportunity to review the newest data and information. She indicated she supports a tutorial that considers each groundwater operable unit and has a clear expectation of action to follow.
- Several committee members agreed it is appropriate to request updated groundwater information for a March committee meeting. Dick said good three-dimensional information at the B/C Cribs is currently being collected, and the Z9 tank will be finished by April.
- There was some concern whether there would be room for a groundwater tutorial at the April Board meeting. Todd Martin said it is difficult to know whether there will be time for a tutorial since the agenda often changes as the meeting approaches. He also said it would be appropriate to have the tutorial at a Board meeting in the Tri-Cities, to accommodate the agency representatives' schedules.

- Harold Heacock commented that, since the Board has already stated they want the groundwater cleaned up, he believes the only other policy statement to make is to identify a desired end state. Dirk said at a policy level, it is important to anticipate the future rather than react to the past. Reviewing new data and information will help frame future groundwater issues.
- Maynard commented that reviewing the white papers on remedial technologies might help develop value statements regarding new areas the Board has not focused on before.
- Some committee members encouraged the committee to consider future changes in groundwater conditions and uses that may impact current groundwater remediation activities. For example, Greg deBruler said overuse of the Columbia River is already occurring, so decisions about what level to clean the river and groundwater to could amount to telling DOE to take a resource from future interests. He believes DOE has the right and responsibility to apply the best available technology to address groundwater contamination issues.
- Todd said he believes the Board made a previous commitment to develop a values-based groundwater product. In addition, the agencies have said the level of effort is increasing, so a groundwater values product seems to fit with the Board's priority work. Todd indicated the Board has some existing groundwater values, but there are more recent values that should be considered. The product would address what has been done and apply input to specific project decisions that are being made. He indicated this would require significant committee work before bringing it to the Board.
- Maynard said it would be important to involve groundwater issues in upcoming cleanup decisions. Several committee members said groundwater issues also dovetail with the Tank Closure/Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) scoping. Pam expressed concern about the groundwater modeling in the TC&WM EIS, which is a significant issue the Board needs to emphasize during scoping. Greg expressed concern that there are pieces being left out of the TC&WM EIS, such as evaluating whether potential cumulative impacts might affect how groundwater decisions are made.
- Dirk commented that it is important to consider competing soil and groundwater cleanup goals. It is crucial for the Board to make clear that groundwater discussions include groundwater as well as the vadose zone. He emphasized that validation of conceptual models using current conditions should drive which decisions should or should not be made.
- The committee would like to receive information from the agencies about timeframes for operable unit decisions, treatment decisions, alignment of groundwater decisions, RCRA-CERCLA integration, MCLs and ACLs, information gaps, and technical challenges. The committee could use this information to frame the Board tutorial and product.
- Groundwater issue managers are Maynard Plahuta, Shelley Cimon, Rob Davis, Vince Panesko, Tom Stoops, and Dirk Dunning. Issue managers will review the white

papers on groundwater remedial technologies to develop input for Mike Thompson, DOE-RL. Issue managers will provide an overview of the technologies and their impacts, and work with agency representatives to frame topics for discussion. Issue managers should work with Shelley to coordinate with DOE representatives. An issue manager meeting is planned for Wednesday, February 15 at 10:00 a.m., to discuss the white papers and March committee agenda.

Tank Closure/Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS)

Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), updated the committee on the status of scoping planning for the TC&WM EIS. The February scoping meetings have been cancelled due to schedule and logistical concerns. DOE-ORP is planning to reschedule the scoping meetings during the week of March 20. The public comment period has been extended until April 10. The committee and the Board thanked Mary Beth for accommodating stakeholders' scheduling concerns.

Mary Beth discussed the structure and composition of the TC&WM EIS, including consideration of waste from the Hanford Tank Farms, Tank Waste Treatment Facilities, Waste Disposal Facilities, and Non-Tank Farm Waste Sources.

Regulator Perspectives

- Suzanne Dahl, Ecology, said Ecology wants a cumulative EIS. She recognized the difficulty to produce a cumulative EIS that evaluates a large number of alternatives. She said it is good that all facilities are dealt with in worst-case scenarios.
- Ron Skinnarland said Ecology is hoping the TC&WM EIS scoping process will determine the baseline assumptions and the alternatives to best identify the decisions that need to be made. He said Ecology has not had a chance to discuss this with EPA or DOE.

Committee Discussion

- *Considering the extension of the scoping period, has the end date for the Record of Decision (ROD) also been extended?* Mary Beth said the end date for the ROD remains the same.
- *Does the EIS account for waste to be sent to a central storage facility like Yucca Mountain?* Mary Beth said waste greater than class C is accounted for in the EIS. She said DOE has the potential for creating a waste form at Hanford that does not have a clear disposition path, and they will have to determine how to deal with it.
- *Will the EIS account for all existing waste at Hanford? Is there any waste not included in the EIS?* Mary Beth said the cumulative section of the EIS would analyze all Hanford waste, but the alternatives section would not. Waste streams like the

Purex tunnels will appear in the cumulative section of the EIS, but not in the alternative portion of the EIS.

- *Will wastes not accounted for in the EIS alternatives be evaluated by other specific alternatives?* Mary Beth said if the impact of a particular waste stream is evident across the geographical area, it would be considered in the cumulative section of the EIS; however, future decisions will determine specific disposition alternatives for these waste streams.
- *Will N Reactor would be accounted for?* Mary Beth said N Reactor would be covered in the cumulative portion of the EIS, but not in alternatives.
- Committee members expressed concern that disposition decisions for several facilities are being made without the proper alternative analysis. Mary Beth indicated a follow-on EIS, a near-term action, or far-term action may be necessary for some facilities. Final disposition decisions for these facilities will not be made in the TC&WM EIS, but an end state will be assumed.
- *Although some end state assumptions must be made in this EIS, is it appropriate to assume the EIS and local waste disposition activities will be part of the process to determine a national disposition strategy?* Mary Beth said data is still being collected to inform the process, so it is difficult to suggest all the connections at this time.
- *Will Hanford's pre-1970 transuranic (TRU) waste be part of the cumulative section of the EIS?* Mary Beth said the EIS accounts for pre-1970 TRU waste remaining at Hanford, and post-1970 TRU waste being dug up, processed, and sent to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP).
- Some committee members said they could not make substantive comments on the cumulative section of the EIS if they have not seen a comprehensive list of items in the cumulative section. Mary Beth said the cumulative section of the EIS covers everything at Hanford.
- *Al Boldt asked whether the no action alternative in the EIS assumes pre-1970 TRU waste will be left in place or that a barrier will be installed?* Mary Beth said she was not sure what the no action alternative stipulates for pre-1970 TRU waste. Al said he believes assuming a barrier in the no action alternative amounts to a treatment decision.
- Jeff Luke wondered whether the no action alternative, as defined by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), would be to leave waste in place. Gerry Pollet said he believes the no action alternative should be to follow State legal requirements as the presumed baseline. He suggested the no action alternative cannot be to ignore legal requirements, and the action would be to seek exemption from those requirements. Suzanne said her understanding of NEPA is that a no action alternative presumes no action is taken. Jeff requested clarification on the definition of a no action alternative from DOE-ORP or Ecology regarding buried pre-1970 TRU waste. Ron said he will look at the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requirements and come back to the committee with an interpretation of the SEPA guidelines. Mary

Beth said the TC&WM EIS illustrates DOE's current understanding of future conditions.

- Gerry expressed concern that DOE-ORP's assumption that pre-1970 TRU will be left in place amounts to a violation of the agreement to retrieve waste from burial grounds to the extent practicable. He asked how Ecology would address the issue of State legal requirements being left out of the EIS scoping process? Ron Skinnarland said the process is in the scoping stage and decisions have not been made about burial grounds. He said many decisions are ahead of characterization information, but that Ecology is very cognizant of its regulatory responsibilities.
- *Gerry asked whether Ecology would produce a document in the next 60 days that lists the minimum State scoping requirements for the TC&WM EIS?* Ron said Ecology's preference is to attempt to meet State requirements during the scoping process. If the scoping process breaks down, Ecology has the option to initiate a dispute resolution process. Gerry said having a list of State requirements would be helpful and Ron said he would forward Gerry's request to the appropriate individuals at Ecology.
- *As a cooperating agency in the EIS development process, does Ecology intend to use SEPA requirements as a guide?* Suzanne said if Ecology were a co-author of the EIS, it would have to ensure SEPA requirements were met. The interaction between Ecology and DOE-ORP will guide the development of the EIS document to meet all SEPA needs. If the EIS does not meet SEPA requirements, Ecology has the option to officially say the EIS does not meet SEPA requirements on specific items.
- *Has DOE-ORP included supplemental treatment facilities for tank waste in the EIS scope?* Mary Beth said the supplemental treatment alternatives considered in the TC&WM EIS are the same as those in the Tank Closure EIS (TC EIS).
- *Will the Energy Northwest reactor be included in the TC&WM EIS after it is shut down?* Mary Beth said she would find out whether the Energy Northwest reactor is included. Dick Smith noted that commercial facilities require their own EIS.
- *Since the Solid Waste EIS (SW EIS) is no longer applicable, what provides SEPA coverage?* Suzanne clarified that the SW EIS no longer applies for things related to groundwater modeling, but it remains applicable for operational processes.

Vince Panesko and Susan Leckband reviewed previous Board advice on the SW EIS and the TC EIS, and discussed issues to include in the Board's scoping comments on the TC&SW EIS. Vince presented Code of Federal Regulations scoping guidelines to indicate what information needs to be in the TC&WM EIS document. He said these guidelines force DOE to develop a cumulative EIS for Hanford. Vince also reviewed and summarized the TC&WM EIS Notice of Intent (NOI) for the committee. He described the potential range of alternatives, and highlighted changes made as a result of Board advice.

- *Why were SX and BX tank farms chosen for the partial tank removal alternative in the NOI?* Mary Beth said those tank farms were chosen because they have some tanks with leaks and wanted some field

investigation reports to understand the impact of excavating those leaking tanks.

- *What does the term “No Separations” mean in the NOI?* Mary Beth said there are two alternatives that treat all the tank waste as high-level waste (HLW), so there is no separation between HLW and low-activity waste (LAW).

Vince also provided a list of the Board’s comments on the scopes of the TC EIS and the SW EIS from previous Board advice (Advice #s133, 140, 144, 148, 153, 157, 162and 164).

- The committee discussed whether the Board should re-submit its previous comments on the SW EIS. Susan suggested the Board reevaluate previous comments to identify those that are still valid, add new comments, delete comments that have been addressed, and resubmit valid past comments. Committee member comments should be sent to Susan and Vince by March 3. Issue managers from RAP and the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) will then consolidate the input to prepare for drafting advice.
- Maynard commented that, to the extent practicable, DOE-ORP should address comments made on previous EIS documents. Todd added that DOE-ORP should post previous comments on a website and notify commentors of the TC&WM EIS scoping process to the extent practicable. Vince suggested developing a mechanism for tracking comments and their responses, in order to inform people where their comments were incorporated into the document.
- Based on the DOE Headquarters’ (DOE-HQ) review of the SW EIS, Gerry said three areas – health, safety, and transportation – were identified as not defensible. He believes the scope of the TC&WM EIS must include new analyses of these issues. He indicated this is a potential topic to highlight in Board advice.

Committee Business

- The committee discussed topics for a March meeting:
 - Additional information session on groundwater.
 - 200-SW-2 (unlined burial grounds) work plan and budget.
- The committee agreed no February call was necessary.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING WITH THE RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE AND THE BUDGETS AND CONTRACTS COMMITTEE

*February 8, 2006
Richland, WA*

DOE-RL Fiscal Year 2006 (FY06) Budget Allocations and Funding

Greg Jones, DOE-RL, and Jeff Frey, DOE-RL, presented an update on project baseline summary (PBS) funding decisions being made on the FY06 budget allocation.

Jeff described DOE-RL's FY06 budget priorities, including the K Basin Closure Project, the River Corridor Closure Project, TRU Retrieval, and D&D of the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP).

Jeff discussed some change of assumptions and scope between the FY06 request and appropriation, and reviewed PBS funding allocations.

For Fiscal Year 2007 (FY07), Greg indicated DOE-RL was able to reclaim some cleanup funding reductions. He said DOE-RL is trying to get the amount of Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) funding reduced, to apply more funding to other Central Plateau cleanup activities. In addition, DOE-RL is not investing as much funding in safeguards and securities. Greg also noted that DOE-RL has a fully-compliant program for FY06.

Regulator Perspectives

- Larry Gadbois said the 200 Area Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RI/FS) work is an ongoing concern. This RI/FS work continues not to be adequately funded, which prompts DOE to approach EPA for extensions. Larry said DOE has a presumptive cleanup strategy, which precludes RCRA and CERCLA decisions. For instance, he indicated that DOE has several caps planned for 200 Area waste sites, which reduces the need for RI/FS work.
- Nolan Curtis, Ecology, said impacts from the FY06 budget allocation were severe. Ecology's concerns have been consistent that funding reductions are unacceptable. A major concern going forward is the recovery funding lost in FY06 and its impacts on out-year milestones, the work force, and work schedules. Gerry indicated the committee would like to hear Ecology's position on specific PBS activities.

Committee Discussion

- *What is the official status of the plutonium consolidation strategy?* Greg said nothing official has been issued, but the Hanford field offices are operating and planning

under the assumption that plutonium is going to be consolidated at Savannah River. This means DOE-RL is not going forward in FY06 with design for a storage facility. Jeff said the good news is that there is a strong effort to revisit the need for long-term storage at Hanford.

- *Why does the roof at PFP need to be replaced if DOE-RL does not need to plan for long-term plutonium storage and should be able to D&D the building to slab-on-grade?* Jeff said DOE-RL has to maintain the buildings for worker safety and security in the near-term.
- *What are the constraints in well D&D?* Jeff indicated that some constraints are funding related, while others stem from needing to identify high priority wells for D&D.
- Gerry commented that a major concern is the continuing remedial investigations of U Plant waste sites. Jeff said there are more investigations going on, but not a lot of remediation work yet. He indicated the need to increase the efficiencies of the agreement writing and field investigation processes to get remediation activities started. He said DOE-RL is installing a haul road to provide a more efficient way of getting at the waste sites in the 200 Area.
- The committee discussed recommendations for prioritizing PBS work. Jeff reminded the committee that FY06 is halfway done, and project funding is already committed. He said DOE-RL is currently thinking about shifting priorities for the FY07 work scope; consequently, Board advice on the FY07 work scope and FY08 budget request would be most useful.
- Todd clarified that the delayed cleanup work in FY06 is the Central Plateau RI/FSes. Larry said DOE-RL is doing some RI/FS work, but needs to do more considering recent budget problems. Jeff said DOE-RL is planning to do RI/FS work, but have had to focus on immediate-need activities, such as plume removal.
- Rick Jansons noted that FY06 saw significant layoffs of skilled workers. The FY07 budget request reduces funding for PFP from \$196 million to \$81 million. In terms of risk, plutonium stored in drums is not a major concern, but any material still in the facilities, which requires skilled, trained people to handle, is of significant concern from a funding perspective. He believes funding should be maintained, while other cleanup activities, where clearances and a specially-trained work force are not required, should be delayed instead. Greg said TPA milestones drive DOE's cleanup work at Hanford, so it is harder to rationalize maintaining funding for the PFP PBS, which has relatively few milestones. There are also control point issues that impact how PBS funding can be re-allocated.
- *Is DOE still functioning under a 2012 control point?* Greg said until Congress tells DOE it is no longer in a particular control point, DOE-RL has to operate under existing control points. Jeff said there has been discussion about implementing even more constricting control points. There is some discussion of transferring funds from K Basin Closure to PFP; Congress is watching very closely to make sure there is consensus within DOE supporting the transfer.

- Gerry Pollet and Rick Jansons presented documents they developed comparing the Fiscal Year 2005 (FY05) budget, the FY06 budget request, the FY06 allocation, and the FY07 Congressional Budget Request for DOE-RL and DOE-ORP. Gerry said the biggest issue for FY07 is the 2006 Closure Account, which includes a promise from DOE to maintain the overall DOE-EM budget when sites are closed. Considering current budgets, the DOE-EM budget has been reduced significantly. If the DOE-EM budget had been maintained, the Hanford field offices would have had an additional \$300+ million in annual funding. He believes reminding DOE-HQ of its promise to maintain the DOE-EM budget should be part of Board advice on the FY07 budget request. Susan said DOE-HQ has already said it will not maintain the DOE-EM budget. Gerry said it is up to Congress.
- The committee discussed drafting two pieces of advice. The first to be addressed to DOE-HQ, advising them to restore and maintain the DOE-EM budget, and the second to the Hanford field offices, about FY07 priorities.

Action Items / Commitments

- Dick Wilde committed to find out how much water is leaking from the reservoir in the 100-D Area for Greg deBruler.
- Dirk Dunning requested a copy of the report on calcium polysulfide (CPS). Dick said he would plan to present the report to the committee.
- Karen Lutz, DOE-RL, said she would find out whether DOE is considering reinstating the Site Technology Coordination Group (STCG).
- DOE-RL will provide the rationale for selecting the uranium contamination remediation technology, and will provide the committee with the white papers on the various technology options.
- Groundwater issue managers (Maynard Plahuta, Shelley Cimon, Rob Davis, Vince Panesko, Tom Stoops, and Dirk Dunning) will consider the white papers on groundwater remedial technologies over the next couple weeks to develop input for Mike Thompson, DOE-RL. Issue managers will develop an overview of the technologies and their impacts, and work with agency representatives to frame topics for discussion. Issue managers should work with Shelley to coordinate with DOE representatives as necessary.
- Ron Skinnerland, Ecology, said he will look at the SEPA requirements and come back to the committee with an interpretation of the SEPA guidelines for EIS scoping.
- Gerry Pollet requested a list of State requirements for the TC&WM EIS. Ron said he would forward Gerry's request to the appropriate individuals at Ecology.
- For the March committee meeting, Vince Panesko and Susan Leckband will be the RAP leads on consolidating comments for TC&WM EIS scoping.
- Jeff Frey will find out whether DOE plans to consolidate special nuclear material at the Savannah River site and get back to the committee.

Handouts

NOTE: Copies of meeting handouts can be obtained through the Hanford Advisory Board Administrator at (509) 942-1906, or tholm@enviroissues.com

- Hanford Groundwater Overview for Hanford Advisory Board River and Plateau Committee, Dick Wilde, DFSH, Feb. 9, 2006.
- TC&WM EIS Scope and Alternatives, Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP, Feb. 8, 2006.
- Previous HAB Advice on Scope for TC or SW EIS, Vince Panesko, Feb. 8, 2006.
- Notice of Intent summary, Vince Panesko, Feb. 8, 2006.
- Code of Federal Regulations – 40 CFR 1501.7 Scoping, Vince Panesko, Feb. 8, 2006.
- 2006 Meetings and Public Comment Periods Timeline, Feb. 8, 2006.
- Richland Operations Office Near Term Project Work Scope, DOE-RL, Feb. 8, 2006.
- FY 2007 Funding Schedule by Activity – Richland Office, Rick Jansons, Feb. 8, 2006.
- USDOE Hanford Clean-Up FY 2007 Congressional Budget Request in Comparison to Appropriations for FY 2006 and 2005 for Richland and ORP (High-Level Waste) Field Offices, Gerry Pollet, Feb. 8, 2006.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Al Boldt	Pam Larsen	Gerry Pollet
Shelley Cimon	Susan Leckband	Mike Priddy
Greg deBruler (by phone)	Jeff Luke	Wade Riggsbee
Dirk Dunning	Jerri Main	Dick Smith
Earl Fordham	Todd Martin	John Stanfill
Ken Gasper	Wanda Munn	Gene Van Liew
Harold Heacock	Vince Panesko	Dave Watrous
Lynda Horst (by phone)	Bob Parazin	
Rick Jansons	Maynard Plahuta	

Others

Steve Chalk, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Dan Parker, CHG
Jeff Frey, DOE-RL	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Dick Wilde, DFSH
Greg Jones, DOE-RL	Suzanne Dahl, Ecology	Lynn Lefkoff, EnviroIssues
Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	Dib Goswami, Ecology	Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz, EnviroIssues
	Jeff Lyon, Ecology	Barbara Wise, FH
Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP	Ron Skinnerland, Ecology	Bruce Ford, FH
	Alicia Boyd, EPA	
	Larry Gadbois, EPA	